DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 954 IR 005 434

AUTHOR Edsall, Shirley
TITLE A Study of the Administration, Utilization and Collection Development Policies of Government Document Collections in Community College Libraries Which Have Been Designated as Depositories.
SPONS AGENCY Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Colleges; *Depository Libraries; *Government Publications; Interlibrary Loans; Library Administration; Library Collections; Questionnaires; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

Results of a survey of 51 community college depository libraries are reported. The objectives of the study were to: (1) collect basic data on depositories in community college libraries; (2) ascertain the 'state of the art' in this type of depository with reference to administration, collection development, and utilization of these materials; (3) determine whether definite patterns have evolved which are characteristic of community colleges in these functions; (4) attempt to account for the differences which exist among colleges; and (5) collect information which would be useful for community college depositories for self-study purposes. Recommendations include encouraging more community colleges to become depository libraries. It is also suggested that a program be implemented by the Government Printing Office to promote more communication and greater cooperation among neighboring depositories, with the regional depository taking a more active role in promoting this communication. (AWP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146954

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A STUDY OF THE ADMINISTRATION, UTILIZATION, AND COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT POLICIES OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT COLLECTIONS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARIES WHICH HAVE BEEN DESIGNATED AS DEPOSITORIES

by

Shirley Edsall
CLR Fellow for 1976-77

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Shirley Edsall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Study Undertaken with Grant from Council on Library Resources

IR 005 434

1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY 3

A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLEGES AND THEIR LIBRARIES 5

ADMINISTERING THE COLLECTION 9

- Staffing the Depository Collection
- Location of the Documents
- Organizing the Document Collection
- Basic Problems in Administering the Document Collection
- Relationship to the Regional Depository and the Nearest Selective Depository

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT 19

- Selection Procedures
- Duplicates and Other Federal Documents
- Microfilm
- Collection Management Issues

UTILIZATION OF THE DEPOSITORY COLLECTION 24

- Interlibrary Loan
- Promotion of Government Documents in the Depository Collection

NATIONAL STANDARDS 29

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 31

- Overall Picture of Government Document Depositories in Community Colleges
- Recommendations for the Superintendent of Documents

APPENDIX

- Breakdown of Community College Libraries with Depository Designations by State
- Cover Letter and Questionnaire Sent to Each Community College Library in the Study

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Educational Preparation and Current Professional Development Activities of Librarians	11
2.	Organization of Depository Collections	12
3.	Breakdown by Percentages of Partially Integrated Collections	13
4.	Services of Regional Libraries	16
5.	Distance to Nearest Depository	18
6.	General Promotional Activities	26
7.	Standards for Depositories	29
8.	Percentage of Item Numbers	30

INTRODUCTION

Community colleges grew rapidly in numbers during the 1960's; now there are over 1000 public two-year academic institutions in the United States. The community college is defined as a two-year public college with comprehensive programs including college-parallel and occupational programs as well as community service. Little is known of the libraries in community colleges mainly because of their relative newness. To compound this problem very little research is currently underway relating to these libraries.

At the same time there is also a nationwide interest in the utilization of government document depositories. A few studies of depositories have been undertaken in the past but at no time has there been a separate investigation of those located in community college libraries. These depositories have been lumped in with those located in universities and state libraries and have been overshadowed by these research institutions especially in terms of the size of their collections. Thus, this study was undertaken to help relieve this void which exists in research concerning community college libraries and to add to the information available on one type of government depository.

The objectives of this study were as follows:

1. Collect basic data on the depositories in community college libraries using the survey method.

2. Ascertain the 'state of the art' in this particular type of depository in terms of administering and developing collections of documents and the utilization of these materials.

3. Determine if definite patterns evolve in these particular functions which are characteristic of community colleges.

4. Attempt to account for the differences or discrepancies which exist among the colleges or in comparison with other types of depositories.

5. Collect information which will be useful for community college depositories for self-study purposes.

The various sections of the report and the conclusions relate directly to these objectives and the manner in which they were carried out.

I wish to thank the Council on Library Resources for this fellowship which enabled me to undertake the survey. I learned a great deal about government document depositories in general, especially through the literature search and by following the step-by-step revision of the "Proposed Standards and Guidelines" which the Depository Library Council was undertaking during the time I was doing the study. I was also able to increase my basic knowledge of community college libraries through the library visits and the responses to the questionnaire. In particular I had an opportunity to delve in depth into community college government document depository collections. This experience has increased my knowledge as a librarian and as a teacher and I will be able to use the information directly this year in my courses pertaining to collection development, community college librarianship, and library management.

I also wish to thank all of the community college librarians and the other staff members who were so cooperative in completing the questionnaires and who gave of their time so generously during my visits to their libraries.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Fifty-two community colleges designated as federal government document depositories were identified in the list of depository libraries in the September 1975 issue of The Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications which was the most current listing of depositories available at the time of the study. It was not an easy task to identify these colleges because many community colleges do not use the term, community, in the title. These 52 libraries represented 4 per cent of the total number of government document depositories listed in that issue of the Monthly Catalog.[1]

Letters were sent to the directors of each library explaining the impending study and asking each to participate in two ways: (1) through supplying questions for which the depositories would like to have answers and (2) by completing the questionnaire which would be used to collect the information about the depositories. Of these 52 libraries 2 requested to be excluded from the study: one library was part of a joint arrangement with a university extension and the depository collection was identified with the university and the other library was in the process of relinquishing its depository status. Thus, for the purpose of this study the population was identified as 50 community college libraries. One public two-year technical college asked to be a part of the study. Because it resembled the community colleges in basic characteristics such as enrollment, budget, etc. it was included which brought the final number to be studied to 51. No sample was taken and the results were based on the total population of community college libraries with government document depository collections.

The literature was checked for previous studies and questions were selected from these which would be asked of the libraries, along with those supplied by the community college librarians queried. A questionnaire was

developed, pretested and revised, and mailed to the 51 libraries in September 1976. The person responsible for the depository collection, along with the help of the director of the library, was asked to furnish the required information. The first response brought in 63 per cent of the questionnaires and with 2 follow-up queries 46 libraries, representing a 90 per cent response, supplied the information requested.

During summer 1976 visits were made to eight community colleges which had government document depositories selected to represent various types of characteristics such as size (large and small), age (old and new), size of total collection, geographic setting (urban and rural), and a multi-campus unit. However, the prime factor in the selection of the colleges was geographic setting or the proximity of the colleges to the investigator. Physical quarters, holdings records, methods of making documents accessible to the public, and the attitude of the library staff towards the documents collection were ascertained on these visits. These trips to the libraries made much easier the interpretation of the information reported on the questionnaires from all the colleges which represented the primary means of data collection.

The eight libraries visited were Allegany Community College (Maryland), Bucks County Community College (Pennsylvania), Corning Community College (New York), Henry Ford Community College (Michigan), Montgomery County Community College (Pennsylvania), Orchard Ridge Campus of Oakland Community College (Michigan), San Antonio College (Texas), and Westmoreland County Community College (Pennsylvania).

The collected data was coded, key-punched, and with the aid of SPSS (an integrated system of computer programs for the analysis of social science data) a series of statistical computations, including frequency distributions, descriptive statistics, and correlations were performed on the data. The results of this analysis are included throughout the report.

A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLEGES AND THEIR LIBRARIES

The community colleges which had libraries designated as government document depositories at the time of the study were scattered throughout the United States with a total of 24 states represented. A breakdown of the depositories by state is located in the Appendix. These colleges varied widely in age, enrollment, budgets, and other basic characteristics.

Very few of these community colleges were located in urban areas. Thirty-six out of 43 colleges were either in a rural or suburban setting. Seven were part of a multi-campus program.

The average age of the 45 community colleges participating in the study was 16.4 years. (For the purpose of this particular analysis the two-year technical college was omitted because it was so much older than all of the community colleges.) The average length of time for their libraries having had depository status was 7 years. Three libraries had become a depository during the year prior to the study which would have an effect on various factors, especially document holdings. Only 1 college was a depository prior to 1962 when the new Government Depository Libraries law provided for more designations throughout the country. However, when examining the total age picture of these depositories the youth of the community colleges in general must also be considered. In this study 53 per cent of these institutions had been established since 1962.

The fall 1976 enrollment of the 46 respondents varied from 332 to 24,700 total students. These figures were supplied either by the librarians or ascertained from the 1977 edition of the Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. The average enrollment for these colleges was approximately 5000 as compared with the average enrollment of 3825 students for all public two-year colleges in the United States (community colleges, technical colleges, etc.) as of October 1976.[2] The majority of the colleges (33) studied fell below

this 5000 figure. Six of those over the mean enrollment had 10,000 students or more. Vacancies in senatorial or representative districts and needs of geographic areas, as well as the size of the institution, are important factors when designations for government document depositories are assigned.

The total operating budgets, including salaries, of the 43 libraries supplying the data ranged from $45,082 to $1,346,866. The mean operating budget was $224,997 with 16 libraries, or 37 per cent, having budgets above this average.

At the end of the 1975-76 academic year the number of volumes of books in the libraries ranged from 11,500 to 162,870 with a mean of 49,426. The latest revision of the "Proposed Standards and Guidelines" for depository libraries proposed as a minimum 15,000 titles of non-government publications which a depository should have; the format of these titles was undefined.[3] Community college libraries should have no trouble in meeting this new guideline/standard* because most are learning resources centers incorporating all types of materials into their collections such as filmstrips, records, slides, maps, and other media, along with the books. The 2 libraries which at the time of the study had fewer than 15,000 volumes were also less than 5 years old.

Sixty-five per cent of the libraries utilized the Library of Congress classification for their regular collections; 5 libraries integrated all library materials on their shelves. About 50 per cent had a union catalog which listed all materials, irregardless of format, in the library. A trend towards divided card catalogs was apparent with approximately 70 per cent reporting this format; the majority of these libraries utilized the author-title and subject type of division.

*referred to throughout the report in this manner because quantitative guidelines have a way of becoming standards in the eyes of many.

Thirty-four per cent of the community college libraries with federal document depository collections were also depositories for other documents: state documents(14 libraries), local documents (6 libraries), and ERIC (6 libraries).

Staffing in the community college libraries was broken down into the following categories: librarians, other professionals (undefined), paraprofessionals, technicians, clerks, and student assistants. All staff reported in the following paragraphs have been computed in terms of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff, not head count. The community college libraries with government document depository collections averaged 12.5 total staff members, excluding student assistants.

The average number of librarians was 4, although 43 per cent of the libraries reported more than this figure. Fifty-four per cent had no 'other professionals' but for those libraries reporting staff in this category which, although undefined, in a community college could have been media staff, the range was from 1 to 4. Looking at the total professional staff members in these community colleges with government document depositories the average number was 5 professionals.

In terms of support staff the distinction between clerks and the category of paraprofessionals and technicians is sometimes very blurry so these categories should be looked at together. Paraprofessionals and technicians were very common in the community colleges with an average of 3 being reported; 3 libraries had over 10. The mean number of clerks was 4 but the range was vast running from 0 to 23 with a majority of the libraries having 4 or fewer. The community college libraries averaged 7.5 total support staff. Taken as a group, the ratio of professional staff to support staff, excluding student assistants, was 1:1.5. (based on FTE count)

Student assistants were very common in the community colleges, only

one library reported none, and as in most academic libraries performed very significant support functions. The range in the 40 libraries reporting the data was from 0 to 125 with a mean of 15 1/2 students. Student hours averaged 253 hours per week.

Only 1 library reported restrictions on the use of library materials, except government documents, within the building and this was for those individuals living outside the county. Twelve libraries had no restrictions on who could withdraw materials from the library. Of the remainder 22 per cent have the more typical academic library policy of limiting circulation to faculty, staff, and students. The others circulated materials to residents (adults) of the community, with 'community' being defined very liberally to include in some cases not only city or county but even state. It can therefore be concluded that these community college libraries with government document depository collections possessed very liberal circulation policies in terms of serving the community and the general public.

ADMINISTERING THE COLLECTION

No distinction in availability to the public was made between government publications and other materials in the libraries; the libraries were open an average of 69 hours per week for all materials. To aid in the usage of the documents a government documents librarian or reference staff member was on duty an average of 60.5 hours per week.

Staffing the depository collection

A wide variety of answers were given when the libraries were asked what department or personnel was responsible for the government documents materials. No set pattern emerged, although 30 per cent responded that the public services personnel was responsible for them; 6 libraries placed the depository under the technical services department. However, even if a department or person was designated as having primary responsibility for the collection, others such as processing, receiving, and stack personnel were also involved. Even the 12 libraries which housed their documents separately did not utilize a totally separate staff for all of the functions. The majority of the libraries which had other depositories such as ERIC, state, and local documents reported that the personnel responsible for the federal documents were also responsible for these materials.

Because of the smallness of community college library staffs in general it is common for one person to have responsibility for more than one function. This was evident in the above paragraph and even more obvious when the libraries were queried as to the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff members which were directly assigned to the government documents. It was necessary to interpret most of the responses to the nearest tenth of one per cent. The average number of FTE librarians was .4, although the most common response was from 11 libraries with .1 librarian. Six libraries, however, had 1 or more librarians

directly assigned to documents.

Fifty per cent of the libraries reported using an average of .3 clerical workers. The majority do not use paraprofessionals or technicians with government documents, although 3 small libraries reported that a paraprofessional was directly responsible for the depository under the direct supervision of the director. Sixty-four per cent of the depositories have students working with government documents with 1 student being the average but ranging to 4 students. For those libraries using student help the average number of student hours per week was 9.

The most common pattern for staffing the government documents depository was a librarian working part-time with some clerical and student assistant help. Occasionally a librarian worked part-time on the collection with only student assistant aid.

When looking at the overall picture of staffing, the ratio of professional to support staff, excluding students, was 1:1.3 for the depository collection (based on FTE). Student help should definitely be taken into consideration, however, because it was an important source of clerical assistance to these libraries. The 1:1.3 ratio is lower than the 1:3 ratio suggested by the latest revision of the "Proposed Standards and Guidelines" but it is in line with the total staffing relationship in these community colleges which was reported earlier as 1:1.5. (There is a problem in equating the actual ratio with the one proposed by the document mentioned earlier because one does not know if this latter ratio was computed using head count or FTE.)[4] When looking at the salary budgets of the libraries there was a significant relationship ($r = .4085$ at .3%) between the number of government documents librarians and the salary budget. This relationship was also true between the total number of librarians in the colleges and the salary budget ($r = .8953$ at .1%). It can therefore be concluded that although the staffing was small for the government documents, the depository

collection was being treated similarly to the rest of the library programs in the community college libraries.

Staff characteristics relating to former education and current professional development activities in the area of government documents were ascertained. These characteristics were broken down into the following activities: completed a government documents course in library school, participated in a seminar or workshop relating to government documents within the past 2 years, and belonged to GODORT or a local organization concerned with government publications. The following table illustrates the number of community college libraries with at least one librarian involved in the particular activity.

TABLE 1

EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION AND
CURRENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF LIBRARIANS

Government Documents Course	Seminar/Workshop Within Past 2 Years	GODORT	Local/Regional Association
27 (60 per cent)	19 (42 per cent)	7 (16 per cent)	4 (9 per cent)

The librarians were obviously active in seminars and workshops although these activities must have originated outside of the depository network because there was minimal sponsorship of workshops by neighboring or regional depositories. Other organizations must have been filling this void.

There was a poor showing in terms of GODORT membership which is unfortunate because this association could furnish a sounding board for common problems of community college libraries which are government documents depositories. This pattern could relate directly to the low membership of community college librarians in the American Library Association which was evident in a previous study the author undertook relating to career patterns of community college librarians.

In that study 63 per cent of the community college librarians throughout the United States were not members of the American Library Association in 1973.[5]

Taking the activities of the librarians as a group, 36 libraries, or 80 per cent of the 45 responding, had at least one librarian involved in one of the activities on the preceding page. One could conclude therefore that librarians in community college libraries which were designated as government documents depositories were attempting to relate to the educational demands of maintaining such a collection.

Location of the Documents

Each depository was asked to characterize the organization of its document collection. Six totally integrated their documents, twelve kept them in a separate collection, and the remainder integrated some with the regular collection and kept the others in a separate location. The following table illustrates a trend towards integrating documents into the regular collection by the libraries which had larger book collections and a tendency towards separate collections for the smaller libraries.

TABLE 2

ORGANIZATION OF DEPOSITORY COLLECTIONS

Volumes (Books)	Integrated	Partially Integrated	Separate
11,500 - 50,000	2	16	11
50,000 - 100,000	2	11	1
100,000 - 200,000	2	1	0
Total Libraries	6	28	12

This trend was also in evidence when the 28 libraries which partially integrated their documents with the regular collection were asked to break down into percentages the number integrated and those documents kept in separate collections. The table on the following page shows how the pattern changes

with the size of the book collections of the libraries.

TABLE 3

BREAKDOWN BY PERCENTAGES OF PARTIALLY INTEGRATED COLLECTIONS

Volumes (Books)	Integrated (Per Cent)	Separate (Per Cent)
Below the Mean of 49,426	14	86
Above the Mean of 49,426	29	71
Average of all 28 Libraries	25	75

A definite factor in the tendency of the smaller libraries to house documents separately would be the size of the staffs. Utilizing the Superintendent of Documents classification which is supplied with each document, rather than trying to classify each by Library of Congress or Dewey classification which have not been readily available, is much easier if the cataloging staff is limited. As more help became available in the larger libraries one can see the trend in the previous tables towards integrating as many documents as was feasible with the other library materials. This would be in line with the learning resources concept in community college libraries where all types of materials are housed in the library and in many cases integrated on the shelves with the books. Now that the Cataloging Distribution Service of the Library of Congress is considering distributing the GPO Monthly Catalog printed cards one may see in the future the number of documents integrated into the regular collections of the community college libraries increased to a greater percentage by all sizes of libraries. This printed card service will be a great solution to the problem of cataloging and classifying the documents in the smaller library.[6]

The libraries which partially integrated their documents into the regular collection of library materials were asked if there were guidelines for integration. Four types of materials most often mentioned as frequently integrated were periodicals (especially if they were indexed in regular library periodical indexes), selected monographs for the regular book collection, documents considered as

reference tools, and pamphlets kept with the vertical file materials. Several libraries said there were no guidelines but each document was placed in the area where it would receive the greatest use.

Only three libraries kept their documents in a closed stack arrangement. Ninety per cent of the libraries which have any documents housed separately used the Superintendent of Documents classification system for arranging them.

Organizing the Document Collection

Sixty-one per cent of the libraries had a shelf list of their government documents in the depository collection; ten of these also added federal government documents which were not received as part of the depository designation to it.

In terms of providing public access to the information in the government publications which were not integrated with the regular library materials, the libraries listed the following means:

1. Seventeen (41 per cent) indicated that the Monthly Catalog was used as a substitute for cataloging documents, but only 6 (13 per cent) used this tool to indicate holdings.
2. Eleven (25 per cent) had a separate government documents catalog.
3. Nine (23 per cent) added entries for government documents to the main catalog.
4. Four (10 per cent) had a separate section in the main catalog devoted to government documents.

If the main catalog or the Monthly Catalog were not being utilized to inform the patrons of the contents of the documents in the collection, the libraries were asked to indicate what other means were employed. Several methods were mentioned as follows: shelf list of documents, 'see also' references in the main catalog, library instruction, acquisition lists, subject bibliographies,

pathfinders, and item number files.

With the Monthly Catalog information being incorporated into OCLC files and as mentioned earlier the proposed availability of the GPO Monthly Catalog printed cards, these libraries will perhaps attempt to add more entries to the main catalog and minimize the need for separate listings of documents.

When queried about the problem of public access to information in the documents, about one-half of the libraries reported that a librarian or member of the library staff needed to help a patron find a government document in a specific subject area or by title. This would be a direct result of the organization of the materials which were not classified with the regular collections as discussed on the previous page.

Basic Problems in Administering the Document Collection

Each library was asked to list the problems which it had in administering its depository collection. Frequently mentioned were depository regulations or relations with the Government Printing Office such as discarding limitations, claiming problems, and lateness of the Monthly Catalog which were not directly in the realm of this study. The internal problems of administering the collection most often listed involved adequate staffing, space to shelve the documents, and time to make the public aware of the information in the documents. From the responses the attitude of the staff towards the depository collection was definitely not a problem. The enthusiasm for the depository designation was evident even though dampened by the frustrations of budgetary limitations.

Relationship to the Regional Depository and the Nearest Selective Depository

Eight (17 per cent) of the community college depositories indicated they had no access to a regional depository.

Of the 38 libraries which do have access to a regional, very little communication appeared to exist between the library and the regional depository.

Forty-two per cent of these libraries reported there was no communication, except for discarding documents, and another 33 per cent indicated they only communicated once or twice a year with the regional. Thus, a total of 75 per cent of the community college libraries with access to a regional depository acknowledged having very little to do with it.

The depositories were asked to describe the types of services for which they depended upon the regional. The type of service and the percentage of libraries indicating this service are listed on the following table.

TABLE 4

SERVICES OF REGIONAL LIBRARIES

Service	Per Cent of the Libraries
Discarding Materials	75
Interlibrary Loans	56
Consulting	33
Workshops for the Staff	28
Reference Assistance	22

However, when looking at the results in the table and comparing them with the amount of communication actually reported in the above paragraph, one could interpret these figures, except for discarding, as being more what they expected from the regional rather than what was actually happening between the depository and the regional.

Most community college library depositories were a considerable distance from the regional depository. Only 4 were closer than 50 miles; 60 per cent were over 100 miles away. Distance could be given as a factor for the relatively little communication between the depositories and the regionals. However, there was found to be no significant relationship between the distance to the regional and the amount of communication with it or to any of the services listed in the above table. Therefore, because the majority were over 75 miles from the

regional depository one can not use the excuse of distance as the primary reason for the minimal contact.

If the regional depositories reversed their perceived roles and were looked on less as repositories of materials and more for basic and innovative informational services, this would be a tremendous help to these depositories and would most likely increase the amount of communication taking place between them. For example, only three libraries reported receiving assistance from the regional depository in selecting new depository item numbers which should be the basis for any regional resource planning.

The depositories were also asked to list the type of working arrangements they had with the nearest non-regional depository. Forty-four per cent reported they had none; and of the 24 others the average was 1.9 arrangements which were broken down into reference assistance, interlibrary loan, joint sponsoring of workshops for staff members and the public, and cooperative acquisitons.

About 45 per cent of the libraries indicated they asked for reference assistance and participated in interlibrary loan activities with the nearest non-regional depository. In terms of cooperative arrangements only 1 library reported the joint sponsorship of workshops for their staff members or for the public. Considering document holdings, 2 mentioned they cooperated on the acquisition of documents with the nearest depository while 2 other libraries listed the exchange of shipping lists. Thus, a total of 4 out of 46 libraries worked together with the nearest non-regional depository on cooperative acquisitions.

For the majority of the community colleges distance could also be listed as a factor for the minimal working arrangements with the nearest non-regional depository. Fifty-four per cent of the libraries were over 25 miles from such a depository; for 11 of these the nearest one was 75 miles away. However, when

looking at the total number of working arrangements each library had with the nearest non-regional depository, no significant relationship was found between this number and the distance factor. A more realistic reason for the lack of working arrangements between these depositories, which would probably be true for all depositories in general, would be the philosophy of individuality which overshadows cooperation in most library situations.

The following table shows the proximity of the community college libraries which were designated as government document depositories to the nearest depository, irregardless if regional or selective.

TABLE 5

DISTANCE TO NEAREST DEPOSITORY

Distance in Miles	Number of Libraries
Less than 1 Mile	1
1 - 10	9
11 - 25	14
26 - 75	14
76 - 100	3
Over 100 miles	5
Total Libraries	46

Twenty-two community college libraries, or 48 per cent, have no depository within 25 miles. The majority of these libraries were in regions of the United States which were low-population centers. Since people generally would not go over 25 miles for a publication, approximately one-half of the libraries were performing a major service for the surrounding area.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

Selection Procedures

Seventy per cent of the libraries reported having a selection policy for the depository collection but for the majority this was not in a written format.

There was a poor response when the depositories were asked to give the volume count of documents which were in the library. This would be understandable since the philosophy of handling documents in the community college library, as discussed earlier, tended towards integration or treating as many documents as possible as regular library materials. When considering a combined collection, materials tend to lose their separate identity as they blend in with the total holdings. A more realistic manner of reporting size of document holdings was by item number count which is discussed in the following paragraph.

The average item numbers selected by the 29 libraries in the study which had been depositories for 6 years or longer was 567 or 22.1 per cent of the total item numbers available. (This figure was computed by asking the libraries how many item numbers they selected and then determining the percentage based on the number, 2572 item numbers which were available to depositories in the fall of 1976 as reported by GPO staff members in a telephone call.) It was decided to use those depositories over 5 years of age for computing this figure because it would be unfair to judge the 14 depositories which were relatively young and had not as yet established their pattern of selection. Also Brock pointed out in his article that depositories tended to slow down in the rate of item number selection as they aged because of experience gained and lack of shelf space.[7] Using this older group of depositories should therefore reflect a more stabilized pattern of item selection. When considering all of the depositories the mean percentage of item numbers selected was 20 per cent.

The community college libraries appeared to regularly involve the majority of the librarians in the selection of new depository items with the librarians

who were directly responsible for the documents having the primary responsibility. Twenty-nine libraries regularly or sometimes involved faculty in the selection process but students, local residents, and other librarians in the community had very little input into the selection of the new depository item numbers and the ultimate development of the collection.

Even though local residents were not directly involved in the actual selection of the materials, 67 per cent of the libraries reported that they chose item numbers representing documents of general community interest which were not necessarily for curriculum needs. More specifically 46 per cent chose documents representing interests of local businesses and organizations and another 41 per cent felt they should be doing this also. This would exemplify the expanded community college library attitude towards serving the community which usually does not exist in the university library where selection is primarily for the needs of faculty and students, especially in terms of their research interests.

One important source of selection aid which was not being exploited in most community college libraries was the local advisory committee which generally exists for each technical program. Very few libraries reported working with these committees from the community for input on what documents they would recommend for the specific programs and for the community which would be a great potential for expanded usage of the depository collection. Eighty-three per cent of the libraries did however consider this to be a worthwhile activity.

Duplicates and Other Federal Documents

Additions of duplicates and documents which were not received through the depository designation constituted a very small segment of the documents in the community college depository. The same personnel responsible for the

selection of the new item numbers were also responsible for the selection of these documents.

Duplicates were purchased by about 30 per cent of the libraries but represented on the whole only about .5 per cent of the collections of these depositories. Forty-three per cent of the depositories reported purchasing documents for which they had not selected the item number. The average number of such documents added each year was 68 which represented an overall 4 per cent of the total document collections of these libraries. An average of 17 per cent of these non-depository documents added were retrospective titles which would reflect the relative youth of the majority of the community college depositories and the need to secure basic documents which they had been too late to select. One library reported that all of the non-depository documents it had added were retrospective titles.

The primary tools utilized for the selection of documents not received through depository distribution were the Selected U.S. Government Publications and the Monthly Catalog, with 92 per cent and 79 per cent, respectively, of the libraries reporting using these 2 aids either regularly or sometimes for selection. The column in Booklist edited by LeRoy Schwarzkopf was a source listed by 62 per cent of the libraries which added these documents. A few libraries occasionally used RQ, PAIS, Vertical File Index, shipping lists, and direct requests from the faculty.

The Government Printing Office was the main source of these duplicate and non-depository documents; although some documents were purchased directly from the agency or obtained free from the Congressman or agency. The use of NTIS, DocEx, or a commercial source was negligible or in most cases non-existent.

Microfilm

Only 3 libraries reported purchasing additional microfilm copies of documents received through the depository designation; upon which time the

hard copy in the collection was discarded. Eighty-one per cent indicated they would select some documents on microfilm, instead of hard copy, when that format became available from the Government Printing Office. Standard titles which take up a considerable amount of shelf space and come frequently were mentioned most often as titles which the libraries would select on microfilm. For example, 12 libraries listed the Federal Register, 16 the Congressional Record, and 10 mentioned Government periodicals for which the backruns were needed.

The majority of the libraries were well prepared to make use of the microfilm format immediately. Only 2 libraries were lacking in equipment for reel film and 91 per cent could utilize the fiche format. Thirty-four libraries had equipment for making hard copy from microfilm, but only 10 could produce duplicate fiche for circulation. All of these figures were higher than those for all depositories in general as reflected in the 1975 Biennial Report of Depository Libraries.[8]

Collection Management Issues

The latest revision of the Instructions to Depository Libraries recommended that item numbers should be examined once a year to ascertain if past choices were still relevant or if new item numbers should be chosen. In terms of evaluation of their present document holdings, 72 per cent of the depositories had examined within the past year the item numbers they were presently selecting and had discontinued an average of 38. Five libraries had discontinued over 100 item numbers. When asked how frequently this procedure was undertaken, 42 per cent listed no definite time, but 16 libraries stated that they went through the process once a year.

When asked to comment on the "all or none" rule as it applied to the documents received through a particular item number and its relationship to collection development, 72 per cent declared this to be a problem in their depositories.

As a result of this rule within the past year the libraries estimated they had avoided selecting or discontinued an average of 16 item numbers, with a range from 0 to 150. Several libraries considered this a major problem in terms of administering an effective depository collection. Solutions given by the libraries to the problem centered basically on 3 suggestions: break up the item numbers so that general pamphlets and specialized reports do not come under one item number; have more item numbers which represent only one document, especially the popular ones such as Occupational Outlook Handbook; and allow for more choice within an item number such as for the soil survey (states wanted).

Relating to binding documents 18 out of 44 indicated they bound documents having permanent value in the collection, such as reference books, monographs placed in the regular book collection, and government serials especially the periodicals indexed in the library periodical indexes. Sixty-three per cent of the depositories indicated they replaced missing or mutilated documents which were of permanent value as was their policy for other library materials.

Fifty per cent of the libraries had discarded within the past year government documents which had been retained five years or more. Several mentioned they were too new to worry about weeding at this time. In terms of changes in the present discarding procedures listed in the Instructions to Depository Libraries a few libraries have the problem of no regional depository. Other libraries felt that the across the board retention of all documents for five years was too long and they recommended that this rule be modified.

UTILIZATION OF THE DEPOSITORY COLLECTION

All libraries in the study reported that there were no restrictions on usage of government documents within the library. Forty-one per cent permitted all documents to circulate outside the library building. Of those libraries which have restrictions on document circulation all but one listed reference books and seven mentioned government document periodicals considered part of the library's periodical collection as non-circulating. These categories are materials which are typically not circulated in most libraries.

The majority of the libraries were unable to furnish any definite circulation statistics. This is understandable since most community college depositories integrated at least part of their documents with the regular collection. As with other types of materials this usage would be incorporated into the general circulation statistics.

Each library was asked to comment on usage patterns of the government documents by regular or potential community college library patrons. The following breakdown represents the percentage of libraries reporting that the specified group either regularly or sometimes utilized their document collection: students, 91 per cent; faculty, 84 per cent; and local residents, 65 per cent. On the other extreme 64 per cent of the depositories reported that local librarians either rarely or never used the document collection, as well as 58 per cent reporting that usage by local industries and institutions also fell in this same category. Community college libraries have a great potential for community service through the depository collection which is being utilized by the general public. Even though usage is minimal by specific community groups, as mentioned earlier under Collection Development government documents were being selected for these groups. Utilization could be increased and broadened through input by these groups at the initial stage of selection of item numbers.

Equal usage was reported by the depositories for the vocational/technical/business curricula and the liberal arts (transfer area). Within the first group programs such as allied health including nutrition and nursing, law enforcement, and agriculture were listed by several libraries as regular users of the collection, especially business which was mentioned by 34 per cent of the libraries. In the liberal arts curricula disciplines such as speech, especially the debate team; economics; and health sciences including biology were considered by several as regular users; along with political science and other social sciences, including history, which were listed by one-third of the respondents. All in all, in this open-ended question the faculty and students in 27 different subject areas or career fields were designated as regular users of the depository collection. Thus, government documents covered a wide variety of program offerings and were a valuable source for supporting the curriculum in community colleges as is true in university situations.

Interlibrary Loan

Fifty-five per cent of the depositories have all of the documents available for interlibrary loan. Those libraries which have restrictions reported reference books mainly as those not available and 3 libraries listed periodicals. To ascertain the extent of interlibrary loan transactions in community college libraries which were designated as government document depositories, the respondents were asked how many documents within the past year they had loaned and how many they had borrowed. Sixty per cent of the depositories had borrowed none; the average was 11.6 for those which had borrowed documents. Seventy-four per cent had circulated no government documents on interlibrary loan; for those which had the average was 12.3 documents. An obvious conclusion from the above data is that interlibrary loan activities were not taking up much staff time in community college libraries with government document depositories.

Promotion of Government Documents in the Depository Collection

Along with the ease of usage of documents within the library and the hours available, the degree of promotion by the library has a big effect on the amount any collection is utilized, including government publications.

A checklist of different types of promotional devices garnered from the literature, especially as found in Reynold's article, was presented to each library.[9] This list was divided into general promotional devices and those activities which could be utilized with specific groups representing regular or potential community college library users; i.e., faculty and administration, students, library staff, and the local community.

The percentage of libraries reporting a particular general promotional activity is included in the following table.

TABLE 6

GENERAL PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Activity	Per Cent of Libraries
Subject Lists Containing Government Documents	62
Separate Subject Lists of Government Documents	61
Regular Document Displays	50
Announcements of New Publications in College Newspaper	32
Separate Government Documents Bulletin Board	30
Browsing Corner for Documents	21

Although the most common promotional activity was the preparation of subject bibliographies, none of the libraries had experimented with KWIK or KWOK indexes for the government publications, perhaps because of the unavailability of computer time and expertise. Very few had handouts available pertaining to the usage of the depository collection, but the majority of the respondents felt this was a worthwhile activity. No depositories alerted their Congressman to activities or problems with the depository collection and only one had postcards available for patron mailing to secure the Selected U.S. Government Publications.

The community college libraries with government depository collections were questioned about the development of media programs such as slide-tape presentations on documents in general or specific titles and self-instructional packages on how to utilize various tools. Three depositories reported using slide-tape presentations but only one had developed a self-instructional package relating to government documents. One college which was visited had produced a media presentation on the Monthly Catalog which was being utilized by the libraries in the region. Community college libraries with the degree of expertise in media which is present on many campuses could become leaders in this method of promotion of government documents.

Most community colleges alerted all of the librarians to new documents but only 34 per cent notified the entire library staff. With such small staffs the majority of these institutions involved clerks, paraprofessionals, and students in various ways with the government documents. Keeping these staff members informed on new additions could prove a valuable means for carrying the message about the depository to the general public in the community. Seven libraries have had inservice workshops for the library staff and 70 per cent of the others thought this would be a valuable activity for their libraries.

About three-fourths of the libraries included government documents as a part of the Freshman orientation. Also sixty-two per cent were offering instructions on government documents when requested by the faculty and including a section on government publications in the student library handbook. Library instruction was therefore being utilized regularly to introduce the students to the depository collection.

About one-half of the depositories oriented the new faculty to the depository collection and also had a section in the faculty library handbook on these materials. Thirty-five per cent routed new government publications to the faculty. About one-third attempted to match faculty/administrators' interest profiles with government document subjects which was certainly a

commendable attempt at individualizing service.

Definite means of promoting the documents to the local community were few, although one depository arranged a workshop for small businesses in the area. Materials were selected with the community in mind, including local businesses, organizations, and institutions as discussed earlier but other than a few depositories placing brochures or handouts about the depository collection in neighboring libraries not much was being done to make the general public knowledgeable of the depository collection.

NATIONAL STANDARDS

With the attention now being given to establishing quantitative guidelines or standards as evidenced by the series of revisions of the "Proposed Standards and Guidelines" for depository libraries, the community colleges which were designated as depository libraries at the time of the study were asked to express their opinion on the establishment of specific standards for depositories.

Fifty-six per cent of those responding favored standards for government depositories. However, 22 out of the 37 libraries reporting felt there should be different categories of depositories with the majority stating that each category should have its own standards. When given suggestions of three categories of depository status: research, information, and subject listed in previous writings about depositories, 16 of these libraries felt the community college should be classified in the information category.

Of those libraries favoring standards (22), the following table shows the number which recommended each type of standard.

TABLE 7

STANDARDS FOR DEPOSITORIES

Standard	Number of Libraries
Number of Government Documents Personnel	16
Qualifications for Government Documents Personnel	18
List of Required Titles	16
Required Percentage of Item Numbers	14

When all the libraries were queried as to the minimum percentage of item numbers which should be required of community college government document depositories there was a variety of responses from the 46 libraries expressing an opinion.

The table on the following page shows the breakdown of the percentages

of item numbers and the number of libraries recommending each percentage.

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF ITEM NUMBERS

Percentage of Item Numbers	Number of Libraries
Five	1
Ten	20
Twenty	5
Twenty-five	6
Fifty	1
Undecided	3
Discretion of Depository	6
Number of Libraries	46

The majority of the community college libraries with government depository collections would not be in favor of the guideline/standard of 25 per cent of the available item numbers which is being proposed by the latest revision of the "Proposed Standards and Guidelines."[10] However, as of fall 1976, 34.5 per cent of the depositories over 5 years old would meet this proposed guideline/standard. As reported earlier the average percentage of item numbers selected by the depositories 6 years or older in the study was 22.1 per cent.

A more realistic figure for the community college libraries based on what actually existed in fall 1976 would be a standard of 20 per cent which was the mean percentage of item numbers selected by all of the depositories. Of all the community college libraries 4t 1/2 per cent selected over this 20 per cent figure which also included the holdings of the 3 depositories under a year old at the time of the study. Sixty-four per cent of the depositories, irregardless of age, selected at least 15 per cent of the available item numbers. The rationale for specifying a certain percentage of the item numbers which would apply to all depositories, irregardless of the library's size or objectives, was not explained in the various revisions of the "Proposed Standards and Guidelines."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall Picture of Government Document Depositories in Community Colleges

Community college libraries which are designated as depositories of government publications constitute a very small proportion of the total depositories in the United States. These depositories are located mainly in rural or suburban areas and in community colleges representing all sizes of student enrollment. The book collection in the libraries contains on the average about 50,000 volumes with many other materials such as tapes, films, and media kits included in the collection. These libraries have been designated as government document depositories on the average about seven years.

These depositories tend to be open readily to the general public and consider the local resident to be an integral part of their patron responsibility. The document collections are utilized by a wide variety of subject areas of the curriculum for non-research purposes and also by the general public in the community.

Those libraries with the oldest depository designations select about 22 per cent of the available item numbers. The philosophy of organizational structure of the depository materials tends towards integrating as many as possible with the regular library collections. This trend towards integration increases with the size of the library as determined by the book volume count.

The depositories in community college libraries have problems with adequate staffing to enable them to administer the collection of government publications in the most effective manner. However, the librarians are enthusiastic about the materials and recognize them as integral components of their programs of services to community college library patrons.

Recommendations for the Superintendent of Documents

Encouragement should be given to non-research libraries, such as community college libraries, to become depositories of government publications.

Different categories of depositories which would support different objectives of library service, research being only one of these objectives, should be designated. Even though the criteria of a depository being a research institution is not specifically spelled out, it is very much in evidence in the section of the "Proposed Standards and Guidelines" devoted to eligibility for depository status. For example, one proposed guideline/standard stated that an academic library requesting such status should be prepared to support its "need for research materials."[11] This clause would automatically eliminate all community college libraries, which would not have the stated purpose of developing research collections, from becoming government document depositories. "Need for research materials" is certainly not synonymous with the ability and desire to give good service to the "general public".

Community college libraries with depository status should be considered a vital link in the depository system. With the emphasis on service to the local community which most comprehensive community colleges profess to undertake, these colleges tend to fulfill very readily the objective of the depository library network of making government publications easily accessible to the general public. A majority of the depositories in these community colleges were providing valuable document service to the neighboring areas because they were not located within easy commuting distance to another designated depository.

A program should be launched by the Government Printing Office to promote more communication and greater cooperation among neighboring depositories. The regional depository must be active in promoting this communication and developing a dynamic approach to document resource planning for the region. The government should provide financial, as well as moral, support to these regional libraries to enable them to develop this leadership and assume more responsibility than their present role of repositories of materials.

membership in the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer should be broadened to include individuals other than those from research institutions as exemplified by state, university, and large public libraries. Opinions of smaller public libraries and community college libraries which have a history of offering services to the general public should be represented.

This study of depository designations in community college libraries was unfortunately completed prior to the final version of the new standards and guidelines for depository libraries. The author of this report will therefore refrain from commenting about the specific content of the document, except for one observation. From the tone of the revisions quantitative measures, which have the stated purpose of being guidelines and recommendations not binding regulations, were being developed. The Depository Library Council and the Superintendent of Documents should therefore watch closely that these measures are not utilized in the future to deny or withdraw depository status. As in the case of some smaller community college libraries located in low population centers, a great injustice would be done to the residents of the region if depository status were to be cut off because of the failure to meet the proposed minimum criteria of selecting 25 per cent of the available item numbers. It would be much wiser to study the quality of service being given with the materials which were then available in these institutions. Specifying a certain percentage of item numbers to be selected by every type of depository may also play havoc with the total collection development policies of a library. Why should a library select documents which may not fit in with the objectives of the collection simply to achieve the minimum number of item numbers stipulated for all depositories in general?

In conclusion, the community college libraries with government document depository designations, irregardless of size, have demonstrated an eagerness to make effective use of the depository collection, both within the curriculum and

with members of the local community. In terms of leadership from the Superintendent of Documents, emphasis should be placed on a positive approach of encouraging these depositories to build on their present strengths and to eliminate the problems which hinder them from achieving the desired level of quality in their documents service.

FOOTNOTES

[1]"List of Depository Libraries as of September 1, 1975," Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (September, 1975), 167-193.

[2]Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory (Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977), p. 96.

[3]"Proposed Standards and Guidelines (revised)," Special Supplement to the Public Documents Highlights (August, 1977), 2.

[4]Ibid., p. 4.

[5]Shirley Edsall, "The Career Patterns of Community College Librarians," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1973), p. 146.

[6]Letter from David Remington, Cataloging Distribution Service of Library of Congress, July 1, 1977.

[7]Clifton Brock, "Academic Depository Libraries in the Southeast," Southeastern Librarian, XV (Summer, 1965), 84.

[8]Biennial Report of Depository Libraries (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 4.

[9]Catharine J. Reynolds, "Discovering the Government Documents Collection in Libraries," RQ, XIV (Spring, 1975), 228-31.

[10]"Proposed Standards and Guidelines (revised)," p. 3.

[11]Ibid., p. 2.

APPENDIX

BREAKDOWN BY STATE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARIES
DESIGNATED AS GOVERNMENT DOCUMENT DEPOSITORIES

Alabama	3
Alaska	1
Arizona	1
California	2
Colorado	1
Connecticut	1
Delaware	1
Florida	3
Georgia	2
Hawaii	1
Idaho	1
Illinois	2
Iowa	1
Kansas	1
Maryland	2
Michigan	4
New Jersey	2
New Mexico	1
New York	2
Pennsylvania	3
Tennessee	2
Texas	7
Virginia	2
Wyoming	4
Total	50

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND LIBRARY STUDIES

August 20, 1976

To: Community College Librarians working with U.S. Government Publications

From: Shirley Edsall

Recently I wrote to each of you or your library director describing my anticipated study of U.S. government document depositories in community college libraries which is being funded by the Council on Library Resources. I was pleased that over half of you submitted questions to be included in the survey. I have tried to incorporate many of these into the accompanying questionnaire.

Your response to my letter reinforced my belief that such a study would be useful to community college librarians. Members of GODORT and the Advisory Council to the Public Printer have also expressed interest in the survey.

I would appreciate your returning in the enclosed stamped envelop by September 24, 1976, the completed questionnaire and the copy of "The List of Classes of United States Government Publications Available for Selection by Depository Libraries" checked with your current holdings of classes of government documents. The Government Printing Office very generously supplied the copies of the latter publication. Would you please include with the above, the following items if they are readily available: copies of your latest annual report and student library handbook; examples of handouts and/or lists you have produced relating to government documents.

To make the survey really reflect the "state of the art" in government document depositories in community college libraries, I need the support of each of you in supplying the information requested. As I stated in my first letter all information collected will remain confidential. If you are not the director of your library, you may wish to consult with him/her before answering some of the questions. A summary of the results of the study will be sent to each participating institution.

If you experience any problems answering the questions, please feel free to write or call me for clarification. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Enclosures: Questionnaire
A copy of The List of Classes of United States Government Publications Available for Selection by Depository Libraries

LAWRENCE D. BELL HALL AMHERST, NEW YORK 14260 TEL.(716)636-2412

RESEARCH SURVEY OF U.S. GOVERNMENT DEPOSITORY COLLECTIONS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARIES

Name and address of library: _____

Name and title of person(s) completing questionnaire: _____

Note: If there is not enough room to answer a particular question, please use extra sheets.

GENERAL INFORMATION

College

1. Is your college a multi-campus unit? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

2. Statistics: (If multi-campus, give 2 sets of statistics: one for your college and one for the whole institution)
   a. Official enrollment (fall 1976): _____ Full-time _____ Part-time _____ FTE
   b. Number of faculty (fall 1976): _____ Full-time _____ Part-time _____ FTE

3. Regional setting of college: ( ) Rural ( ) Suburban ( ) Urban

Library

1. Organization of library materials:

   a. Which classification scheme do you use for library materials? ( ) LC ( ) Dewey
   b. Do you have collections of library materials in locations other than the main building? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, explain what types are located elsewhere _____
   _____
   c. Do you integrate all library materials on your shelves? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, describe the format of the materials which are not integrated _____
   _____

2. Description of your public catalog:

   a. Please check (✓) type: ( ) Card catalog ( ) Book catalog ( ) Microfilm catalog
   b. Is it a union catalog which lists all library materials? ( )Yes ( )No. If partial, which are included? _____
   c. Is it a divided catalog? ( ) Yes ( ) No.
      If yes, is it? ( ) Author/title; Subject ( ) Author; Title; Subject
      ( ) Other (describe) _____

3. Staff: Number (fall 1976)

	ACTUAL COUNT	FTE
Librarians		
Other professionals		
Paraprofessionals, technicians		
Clerks		
Students (give number and total student hours per week)		

4. Indicate the number of library materials in each category: (end of 1975-76 academic year)

_____ Books (titles) _____ (volumes)
_____ Bound periodicals (volumes)
_____ Periodical subscriptions (titles)
_____ Microfilm (reels)
_____ Microfiche (sheets)
_____ Tapes or cassettes
_____ Records
_____ Films
_____ Filmstrips
_____ Maps
_____ Media kits
_____ Realia
_____ Slides
_____ Models
_____ Other (specify type and number)
_____

5. Does your library have restrictions on who can:

   a. Use library materials within the library? ( )Yes ( ) No. If yes, explain who is ineligible _____
   b. Withdraw library materials? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, explain _____
   _____

6. Hours per week library is open (regular session): _____

OBJECTIVES OF YOUR DEPOSITORY COLLECTION

1. Why did your library become a depository for U.S. government documents*? (*throughout the questionnaire will be referred to as govt docs) _____

2. List the objectives (purposes) of your govt docs depository. If you have a written statement of objectives, please send that instead. Give the most important objective(s) first: _____

DOCUMENT COLLECTION STATISTICS (end of 1975-76 academic year)

	ACQUIRED THROUGH DEPOSITORY	ACQUIRED THROUGH OTHER SOURCES
1. U.S. govt docs titles in collection		
U.S. govt docs volumes in collection		

Are the figures above also included in the collection statistics on page 1? ( ) Yes ( ) No
If yes, in which category(ies)? _____

2. Percentage of increase in govt docs holdings last year? ___% (indicate volumes or titles)

3. Please indicate which of the following you currently acquire for your collection:

( ) Monthly Catalog
( ) US Government (Organization) Manual
( ) Congressional Directory
( ) Price Lists/Subject Bibliographies
( ) Congressional Record
( ) Digest of Public General Bills
( ) Slip Laws (public)
( ) Statutes at Large
( ) US Code
( ) Federal Register
( ) Code of Federal Regulations
( ) Statistical Abstract
( ) Congressional District Data Book
( ) Numerical Lists and Schedule of Volumes
( ) County-City Data Book
( ) Census of Housing (your state)
( ) Census of Population (your state)
( ) Census Bureau Catalog
( ) Vital Statistics
( ) Budget of the US
( ) Weekly Compilation of Presidential Docs
( ) Supreme Court Reports
( ) Monthly Checklist of State Publications
( ) US Treaties & Internat'l Agreement Series
( ) Consumer Price Index
( ) Government Reports Announcements/Index
( ) Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

ORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS COLLECTION

1. Location of your govt docs collection: ( ) Fully integrated with other library materials ( ) Separate, partially integrated ( ) Separate

2. What percentage of the titles are: (e.g. Congressional Record is a single title)
___% in separate collection
___% integrated with other library materials
___% other, describe _____

3. If fully or partially integrated, are there guidelines for integration of your govt docs? (i.e., serials with periodicals, etc.) ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A. If yes, describe _____

4. If partially integrated, do specific types of documents remain in separate collection? ( ) Yes ( ) No ( ) N/A. If yes, describe _____

5. If separate or partially integrated: ( ) N/A

a. How much space is allotted to this collection? (indicate whether square footage, stack ranges, floors, etc) _____ ___
b. Is the space arrangement? ( ) Closed ( ) Open
c. What classification scheme is utilized for arrangement of govt docs housed separately? ( ) Dewey ( ) LC ( ) SuDocs ( ) Combination or other (specify) _____

6. Do you have collections of govt docs in locations on campus other than in your main library building? ( )Yes ( )No. If yes, explain _____

7. Are any of your depository materials regularly put on loan to local institutions or other campuses? ( )Yes ( )No. If yes, specify institutions and types of govt docs in each _____

_____

_____

8. Describe the department(s)/personnel responsible for govt docs depository materials:

( ) Separate govt docs department/division reporting to _____
( ) Not a separate unit. Part of _____
( ) Designated govt docs librarian reporting to _____
( ) None of the above or combination of the above. Please explain _____

_____

_____

9. Indicate number of library staff directly assigned to servicing govt docs:

____ Librarians ____ FTE*
____ Paraprofessionals ____ FTE*
____ Clerks ____ FTE*
____ Students ____ Total hours per week

*If any person indicated above doesn't spend 100% of his/her time on govt docs collection, indicate for each category the FTE of staff time spent on this collection.

10. Indicate the department(s) responsible for each of the following functions including the type of staff (i.e., librarians, clerks, etc.) performing each function and the number (FTE) for each type. (For students give total number of hours per week also.)

Department	Libns #(FTE)	Paraprof. #(FTE)	Clerks #(FTE)	Students #	Hrs.
Receiving and processing shipments of govt docs					
Maintaining holdings records					
Cataloging and processing of govt docs integrated into collection					
Cataloging of govt docs kept in separate collection					
Ordering non-depository govt docs					
Shelf maintenance of govt docs					
Circulating govt docs					
Providing reference service for govt docs					
Providing interlibrary loan for govt docs					

11. Characteristics of librarians working with govt docs (question 10). Specify number for each

____ Have had govt docs course or are currently enrolled in one
____ Member of GODORT
____ Belong to a local or regional govt docs association
____ Have attended a seminar/workshop on govt docs within the past 2 years

12. Indicate other depository collections in the library:

( ) State ( ) Local ( ) United Nations ( ) Census
( ) Maps (specify) _____
( ) Govt sponsored technical reports (e.g. ERIC) specify _____
( ) Other (specify) _____

13. Are the personnel assigned specifically to govt docs (indicated in question 9) responsible for any of these depositories? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, please explain _____

_____

ADMINISTERING THE DOCUMENTS COLLECTION

1. What are the major problems involved in being a depository for U.S. govt docs? _____

2. Information about holdings of govt docs for public use:

   a. Do you have a separate govt docs catalog? ( ) Yes ( ) No.
   A separate section of main catalog devoted to govt docs? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

   b. Are entries for govt docs kept in separate section added to the main catalog?( )Yes( )No
   If yes, is full catalog information given for these? ( )Yes ( )No. If not, what information is included? _____

   c. Is the Monthly Catalog marked to indicate holdings of govt docs? ( )Yes ( )No. If yes, is this for all __ or partial __ ?
   Is location of govt docs held indicated? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

   d. Is a current index, such as Mechanic or Pohle, used for indicating holdings of govt docs? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, indicate which _____

   e. Is the Monthly Catalog used as a substitute for cataloging govt docs? ( )Yes ( )No.

   f. If the Monthly Catalog or other indexes are not checked for holdings and documents aren't included in main catalog, what other means are utilized for making known to users the library's holdings of govt docs? _____

   g. Do you prepare: Subject lists of govt docs? ( ) Yes ( ) No.
   Subject lists including govt docs with other materials? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   KWIK or KWOK indexes of govt docs? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

3. Do you have a shelf list containing each govt doc received through the depository? ( )Yes ( )No. If yes, describe it _____

   Are non-depository docs added to this as they are received? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

4. Are govt docs bound? ( )Yes ( )No. If yes, do you have a specific binding policy indicating types to be bound? ( )Yes ( )No. Please specify or send copy of policy if yes:

5. For weeding, do you go primarily by the list of types of materials which may be disposed of in Section 11 of the Instructions to Depository Libraries? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, what other types of docs do you regularly dispose of? _____

6. Have you discarded govt docs retained for 5 years or more during the past year?( )Yes( )No

7. Is the discarding procedure set up by your regional or GPO workable for a community college depository? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, what procedures would you recommend? _____

8. Do you attempt to replace missing or mutilated govt docs? ( ) Yes ( ) No.

9. What percentage of total budget is allotted to govt docs (other than personnel) each year?
   ____% Materials ____% Supplies ____% Other, please break down _____

REGIONAL AND NEIGHBORING DEPOSITORIES

1. Is your library served by a regional depository? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, go on to Question 2. If yes, please answer the following questions:

   a. What is the distance in miles from your library to the regional? ( ) Less than 1 mile ( ) 1-10 ( ) 11-25 ( ) 26-50 ( ) 51-75 ( ) 76-100 ( ) Over 100 miles.

   b. Approximately how often do you communicate with your regional? ( ) Weekly ( )Once a month ( ) Once a year ( ) Never, except for discarding ( ) Other (specify)

c. For which service(s) do you depend upon your regional?

( ) Consulting
( ) Discarding of materials
( ) Interlibrary loan
( ) "Periodic visits" as described in Instructions to Depositories
( ) Other (specify) _____
( ) Sponsoring workshops/seminars for staff and/or public (indicate which) _____
( ) Reference assistance
( ) Assistance in selection of depository item numbers

2. What is the distance in miles to the nearest selective US govt depository library?
( ) Less than 1 mile ( ) 1-10 ( ) 11-25 ( ) 26-75 ( ) 76-100 ( ) Over 100 miles

3. What working arrangements do you have with this depository?

( ) None
( ) Reference assistance
( ) Joint sponsorship of seminars/workshops for staff/public (indicate which) _____
( ) Other (specify) _____
( ) Interlibrary loan
( ) Cooperative acquisition of documents

USAGE OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

1. Hours per week (regular session) govt docs available for public use. ____ If this varies from hours library is open, explain why _____

2. Hours per week (regular session) documents librarian or reference staff available to give reference service for documents. ____

3. Is utilization of govt docs calculated? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes,

a. How is this determined?
( ) Separate circulation statistics (___ Average # circulated per week/month)
( ) Shelf usage count
( ) Sampling
( ) Estimate
( ) Other (specify) _____

b. What percentage of total library materials usage is govt docs usage? ____

c. Please furnish any available statistics of usage for past year.

4. Indicate degree of usage of govt docs collection by the following groups:
(0 = never, 1 = rarely, 2 = sometimes, 3 = regularly)

___ Faculty
___ Students
___ Local residents
___ Local librarians
___ Local industries, institutions, etc.
___ Other (i.e. other campus units) specify _____

Is the above: ( ) An estimate? ( ) Based on utilization count?

5. Which curricular area makes the greatest use of govt docs? ( ) Voc/tech/business or ( ) Liberal arts (transfer)
Within voc/tech/business, which specific program(s)? _____
Within liberal arts (transfer) which discipline(s)? _____

6. Does a patron need to utilize govt docs librarian or member of library staff to locate a govt doc on a specific subject? ( )Yes ( )No. If a title is known? ( )Yes ( )No.

7. Does your library have restrictions on who can use govt docs within the library? ( )Yes ( )No
If yes, who is ineligible? _____

8. Do all govt docs circulate outside the building? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, which types do not?
_____

9. Are all your govt docs available on interlibrary loan? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, explain exclusions _____

10. During the past year through interlibrary loan how many govt docs were:
____ Borrowed from another library?
____ Loaned to another library?

11. From the Proposed Guidelines: "The objective of the depository library system is to make US government publications readily available for use by the general public and to insure their continued availability in the future." Can the community college library designated as a depository effectively carry through this objective? Please use additional paper.

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

1. Do you have a selection policy for govt docs? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, is it:
   ( ) Written policy? (specify if separate statement or part of library's general selection policy) _____. Please enclose copy.
   ( ) Unwritten policy? (explain) _____

2. Who participates in the selection of new depository items as they become available? (Indicate degree of participation)

	REGULARLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY	NEVER	N/A
Librarian(s) assigned to govt docs collection					
All librarians on staff					
Reference librarians					
Multicampus: librarians from the various campuses					
Faculty					
Students					
Members of local community					
Other librarians in community					
Other (specify) _____					

3. How many of the item numbers available to depositories do you currently select? _____
   How many were added to the collection within the past year? _____

4. Approximately how many govt docs (titles) are added to your collection each year which are not received through the depository? _____ or what percentage of total govt docs collection? _____% What percentage of these are retrospective titles? _____%

5. Does the same group indicated in Question 2 participate in the selection of non-depository documents? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, state how the selection of these documents differ? _____

6. What selection tools are utilized regularly to determine which non-depository documents will be added to the collection. (Indicate frequency of use)

	REGULARLY	SOMETIMES	RARELY	NEVER
Selected List of U.S. Govt Publications				
Monthly Catalog				
PAIS				
Vertical File Index				
Column in Booklist, ed. by Schwarzkopf				
Column in RQ, ed. by Morehead				
Other (specify) _____				

7. For approximately what percentage of your depository collection do you obtain duplicate copies because of need for additional copies? _____%

8. How are duplicates and non-depository documents obtained for the collection? (percent)
   ___% Purchase from GPO
   ___% Free from Congressman/Senator
   ___% Purchase from commercial source
   ___% DocEX
   ___% Other (specify) _____
   ___% Senate committee prints
   ___% Purchase from agency
   ___% Free from agency
   ___% NTIS

9. Do you purchase additional microform copies of govt docs received through depository designation? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes,
   a. Do you then discard the hard copy? ( ) Yes ( ) No
   b. What is purchased on regular basis? (i.e., Serials Set, Federal Register, etc.) _____
   c. What personnel is responsible for handling these microforms? _____

10. If microforms become available through GPO as a possible format for govt docs will you choose to receive some docs in this format rather than hard copy? ( ) Yes ( ) No. If yes, what specific types of materials or categories would you select as microforms? _____

11. Check (✓) available microform equipment in your library for reading:
( ) reel ( ) card ( ) fiche
Do you have equipment for producing hard copy?( )Yes ( )No. Duplicating fiche?( )Yes( )No

12. How often are item numbers available to depositories examined to ascertain which need to be discontinued and which need to be added?
( ) Once a year ( ) Once every two years ( ) No set time ( ) To date hasn't been done
( ) Other (explain) _____

13. How many item numbers did you discontinue within the past year? ____. For how many of these discontinued item numbers did you decide to purchase a particular document formerly received under that designation? ____

14. Estimate the number of items you had to eliminate choosing or decided to discontinue within the past year because of the "all or none" rule (only one publication in an item number is needed). ____. Do you consider this a problem for your library? ( )Yes ( )No.
If yes, any suggestions for correcting this problem? _____

_____

NATIONAL STANDARDS (There is a great deal of discussion about establishing national standards for depository collections. Please express your feelings on this development.

1. Do you favor establishment of national standards for depository libraries? ( ) Yes ( ) No.
If yes, check (✓) items you feel should be included in these standards:
( ) Number of personnel working specifically with govt docs
( ) Qualifications of govt docs personnel
( ) Number of item numbers to be selected
( ) List of required titles to be held
( ) Other (specify) _____

2. If there is a minimum percentage of item numbers which must be selected to retain depository status, how many do you feel a community college depository should have?
( ) 10% ( ) 20% ( ) 25% ( ) 50% ( ) Other (specify) ____%

3. Should there be different categories of depositories? (e.g., research, information, subject specialities, etc.) ( )Yes ( )No. If yes, should standards described in Question #1 above be the same for each category? ( )Yes ( )No. If no, state your recommendations:

_____

In which of these categories would you put the community college depository? _____
With what other types of libraries? _____

PROMOTION OF GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

(Below are some ideas for promotion of government documents which have been discussed. Indicate the degree these are utilized in your library or your expression of suitability of activity. Add others which you undertake or feel should be tried.)

General:	ACTUALLY DONE	SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN	NOT RELEVANT FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Regular displays of new govt docs			
Bulletin board reserved for govt docs			
"Browsing corner" for new govt docs			
Pamphlets/handouts on how to use govt docs			
Indicate availability of govt docs on library directory at entrance			
Announcement of new publications in college newspaper			
Postcards available for patron mailing to obtain "Selected List of US Government Publications"			
Keep Congressman/Senator posted on usage and reaction of public to depository			
Slide/tape program on govt docs collection			
Current awareness newsletter available to users			

Please list other general methods you have utilized: _____

_____

Library Staff:	ACTUALLY DONE	SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN	NOT RELEVANT FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Notify entire library staff of new govt docs			
Notify all librarians of new govt docs			
Inservice workshop on govt docs for librarians/staff			

Please list other methods you have utilized with library staff: _____

Students:			
Orientation on govt docs as separate activity			
Orientation as part of Freshman Orientation			
Required library instruction upon request of faculty			
Student library handbooks devoted to govt docs			
Section in general student library handbook			
Self-instructional package on how to use govt docs			

Please list other methods you have utilized with students: _____

Faculty, Administration of College:			
Orientation of new faculty to govt docs collection			
Faculty library handbook on govt docs			
Govt docs section in general faculty library handbook			
Route selected new govt docs			
Profile of faculty/administrator's interests matched to govt docs subjects			
Display in faculty lounge			
Route "Selected List of US Govt Publications" checked with holdings			
Route new item cards for selection recommendations			

Please indicate other methods you have utilized with faculty/administrators: _____

Local Community:			
Make brochures/handouts available to other libraries in area			
Work through local advisory committees for vocational programs to increase awareness of govt docs relevant to specific vocational programs			
Arrange workshops for small businesses in area on govt docs			
Involve local institutions, i.e., museums, hospitals in selection of new depository items			
Select item numbers of specific value to local businesses, organizations, institutions			
Select item numbers not specifically for curriculum needs but of community interest			
Multi-campus: Select items specifically for curricular needs of other campuses			

Please indicate other methods you have utilized for local community or if multi-campus unit, for faculty, students of other campuses: _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Biennial Report of Depository Libraries. Report Series No. 13. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975.

Brock, Clifton. "Academic Depository Libraries in the Southeast." Southeastern Librarian, XV (Summer, 1965), 82-89.

Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977.

Edsall, Shirley. "Career Patterns of Community College Librarians." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1973.

Instructions to Depository Libraries. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1974.

"List of Depository Libraries as of September 1, 1975." Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications, (September, 1975), 167-93.

Morehead, Joe. Introduction to United States Public Documents. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1975.

Nakata, Yuri. "Profile of Federal Depository Libraries in Illinois." Illinois Libraries, LIII (June, 1971), 431-37.

"Proposed Standards and Guidelines (revised)." Special Supplement to Public Documents Highlights, (August, 1977), 1-6.

Remington, David. Cataloging Distribution Services, Library of Congress. Letter to Shirley Edsall, July 1, 1977.

Reynolds, Catharine J. "Discovering the Government Documents Collection in Libraries." RQ, XIV (Spring, 1975), 228-31.

Schwarzkopf, LeRoy C. "Survey of Regional Depository Libraries for U.S. Government Publications." College Park, Maryland, 1974. 52p. (mimeographed)